REMARKS

Amendments to claims 1, 22, and 43 are for the purpose of clarifying what Applicants regard as the invention. No new matter has been added.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview on November 29, 2005. During the telephonic interview, claim 1 and the cited references were discussed.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,178,511 (Cohen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,879 (Behera).

Claims 1, 22, and 43 recite when the first user logs into the network node, assigning the local user schema to the first user with a first user role, and when the second user logs into the network node, assigning the local user schema to the second user with a second user role. Applicants agree with the Examiner that Cohen does not disclose or suggest a local user schema that is accessible by different users (and therefore, Cohen also does not disclose or suggest assigning the same local user schema to different users with different roles). However, as discussed with the Examiner in the telephonic interview, Behera fails to make up the deficiency presents in Cohen. In particular, the Office Action cited column 4, lines 45-46, and column 3, lines 44-45 and 50-52, stating that Behera discloses allowing access based on role, and allowing users to access the same information if they have the same properties. However, these passages do not disclose or suggest assigning the same local user schema to different users with different roles. For at least the foregoing reason, claims 1, 22, and 43, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Cohen, Behera, and their combination.

Claims 1, 22, and 43 also recite the first user and the second user (i.e., to which the same local user schema is assigned) have different privileges on the network node, wherein a scope of the privilege for the first user is defined at least partially based on the first user role, and a scope of the privilege for the second user is defined at least partially based on the second user role.

9

Neither Cohen nor Behera discloses or suggests such limitation. For this second reason, claims 1, 22, and 43, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Cohen, Behera, and their combination.

Claims 1, 22, and 43 also recite mapping a first global user identification and a second global user identification to a local user schema (i.e., the first and second global user identifications are mapped to a same local user schema). According to the Office Action, column 7, lines 11-27 and figures 7 and 8 of Cohen discloses the above limitations. However, the cited passage of Cohen discloses:

> At step 52, the logon coordinator 26 substitutes given data received from the PKM into substitution variables in the invocation strings returned from the CIM. In particular, the logon coordinator performs a matching operation; for each PKM target entry, the coordinator determines whether there is a corresponding CIM entry. If so, step 52 binds the two entries together. This is illustrated in FIG. 8. At step 54, the logon coordinator 2E invokes the logon method(s) defined by and stored in the CIM. This completes the processing.
>
> Generalizing, the logon coordinator (LC) thus takes the data from the personal key manager (PKM) and the directives in the CIM and interprets the data, together with current state information, to perform a given action. Such action is carried out with respect to the users' systems and applications and includes for example, a logon operation, a change password operation, or a logoff operation.

As such, the cited passage discloses comparing a CIM entry with a PKM target entry, and does not disclose or suggest mapping a first global user identification and a second global user identification to a local user schema (i.e., the *same* local user schema for both the first and second global user identifications), as recited in claims 1, 22, and 43 (See pages 21-25 of the subject application for an example illustrating how a user identification is mapped to a local user schema). Behera fails to make up the deficiency presented in Cohen, and therefore, cannot be combined with Cohen to form the resulting subject matter of claims 1, 22, and 43. For this third reason, claims 1, 22, and 43, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Cohen, Behera, and their combination.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all remaining claims are believed in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this response, please contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518,** referencing billing number **7010852002**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518,** referencing billing number **7010852002**.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: December 7, 2005   By:

Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4960
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800

11